arXiv:1205.2081v3 [math.OC] 10 Dec 2012

The Computational Complexity of the Restricted Isometry Property, the Nullspace Property, and Related Concepts in Compressed Sensing

Marc E. Pfetsch, Andreas M. Tillmann

***Abstract*—This paper deals with the computational complexity of conditions which guarantee that the NP-hard problem of finding the sparsest solution to an underdetermined linear system can be solved by efficient algorithms. In the literature several such conditions have been introduced. The most well-known ones are the mutual coherence, the restricted isometry property (RIP), and the nullspace property (NSP). While evaluating the mutual coherence of a given matrix is easy, it has been suspected for some time that evaluating RIP and NSP is computationally intractable in general. We confirm these conjectures by showing that for a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ and positive integer k, computing the best constants for which the RIP or NSP hold is, in general, NP-hard in the strong sense. These results are based on the fact that determining the spark of a matrix is strongly NP-hard, which is also established in this paper.**

***Index Terms*—Compressed Sensing, Computational Complexity, Sparse Recovery Conditions**

I. Introduction

A CENTRAL problem in compressed sensing (CS), see, e.g., [1], [2], [3], is the task of finding a sparsest solution to an underdetermined linear system, i.e.,

$$\min \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}, \tag{P$_0$}$$

for a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ with $m \leq n$, where $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0$ denotes the ℓ_0-quasi-norm, i.e., the number of nonzero entries in $\boldsymbol{x}$. This problem is well-known to be NP-hard, cf. [MP5] in [4]; the same is true for the variant with $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ replaced by $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$ [5]. Thus, in practice, one often resorts to heuristics. One of the most popular approaches is known as basis pursuit (BP) or ℓ_1-minimization, see, e.g., [6], where instead of (P$_0$) one considers

$$\min \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}. \tag{P$_1$}$$

Here, $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i|$ denotes the ℓ_1-norm. It can be shown that under certain conditions, the optimal solutions of (P$_0$) and (P$_1$) are unique and coincide. In this case, one says that ℓ_0-ℓ_1-*equivalence* holds or that the ℓ_0-solution can be *recovered* by the ℓ_1-solution. Similar results exist for the sparse approximation (*denoising*) variants with constraint $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$.

Many such conditions employ the famous *restricted isometry property (RIP)* (see [7] and also [8], [9]), which is satisfied with order k and a constant δ_k by a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ if

$$(1 - \delta_k)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta_k)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \tag{1}$$

holds for all $\boldsymbol{x}$ with $1 \leq \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k$. One is usually interested in the smallest possible constant $\underline{\delta}_k$, the *restricted isometry constant (RIC)*, such that (1) is fulfilled. For instance, if $\underline{\delta}_{2k} < \sqrt{2} - 1$, all $\boldsymbol{x}$ with at most k nonzero entries can be recovered (from $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} \coloneqq \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}$) via basis pursuit, see, e.g., [10]. Several probabilistic results show that certain random matrices are highly likely to satisfy the RIP with desirable values of $\underline{\delta}_k$, see, for instance, [11], [9]. There also has been work on deterministic matrix constructions aiming at relatively good RIPs, see, e.g., [12], [13], [14]. The RIP also provides sparse recovery guarantees for other heuristics such as Orthogonal Matching Pursuit and variants [15], [16], as well as in the denoising case where the right hand side $\boldsymbol{b}$ has been slightly perturbed and one employs the constraint $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{b}\|_2 \leq \varepsilon$, see, e.g., [10].

In the literature, it is often mentioned that evaluating the RIP, i.e., computing the constant $\underline{\delta}_k$ for some $\boldsymbol{A}$ and k, is presumably a computationally hard problem. Most papers seem to refer to NP-hardness, but this is often not explicitly stated. This motivated the development of several (polynomial-time) approximation algorithms for $\underline{\delta}_k$, e.g., the semidefinite relaxations in [17], [18]. However, while a widely accepted conjecture in the CS community, NP-hardness has, to the best of our knowledge, not been proven so far.

Recently, some first results in this direction have been obtained: In [19], hardness results about the RIP were derived from the complexity of dense subgraph problems, under certain (non-standard) assumptions. In work independent from this paper, [20] shows that it is (weakly) NP-hard to verify (1) for given $\boldsymbol{A}$, k and $\delta_k \in (0, 1)$, see Section III for a discussion.

Another popular tool for guaranteeing ℓ_0-ℓ_1-equivalence is the *nullspace property (NSP)*, see, e.g., [21], [22], [23], which characterizes recoverability by (P$_1$) (in fact, via ℓ_p-minimization with $0 < p \leq 1$, see [24], [25]) for sufficiently sparse solutions of (P$_0$). The NSP of order k is satisfied with constant α_k if

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{k,1} \leq \alpha_k \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \tag{2}$$

Manuscript received June 28, 2012; revised December 10, 2012. This work has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) within the project “Sparse Exact and Approximate Recovery” under grant PF 709/1-1.

M. E. Pfetsch is with the Research Group Optimization at TU Darmstadt, Dolivostr. 15, 64293 Darmstadt, Germany (e-mail: pfetsch@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de).

A. M. Tillmann is also with the Research Group Optimization at TU Darmstadt (phone: +49-6151-16-75833; e-mail: tillmann@mathematik.tu-darmstadt.de).

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

holds for all vectors $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the nullspace of $\boldsymbol{A}$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{Ax} = 0$), where $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{k,1}$ denotes the sum of the k largest absolute values of entries in $\boldsymbol{x}$. Similar to the RIP case, one is interested in the smallest constant $\underline{\alpha}_k$, the *nullspace constant (NSC)*, such that (2) is fulfilled. Indeed, if and only if $\underline{\alpha}_k < 1/2$, ($\mathrm{P}_1$) with $\boldsymbol{b} := \boldsymbol{Ax}$, $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k$, has the unique solution $\boldsymbol{x}$, which coincides with that of (P_0); see, e.g., [21], [22], [26]. Moreover, error bounds for recovery in the denoising case can be given, see, e.g., [23].

Again, the computation of $\underline{\alpha}_k$ is suspected to be NP-hard and several heuristics have been developed to compute good bounds on $\underline{\alpha}_k$, e.g., the semidefinite programming approaches in [27], [28], or an LP-based relaxation in [26]. However, as far as we know, no rigorous proof of (NP-)hardness has been given.

In this paper, we show that it is strongly NP-hard to compute the RIC and NSC of a given matrix with given k; see Sections III and IV, respectively. More precisely, we show that unless P=NP, there is no polynomial time algorithm that computes $\underline{\delta}_k$ or $\underline{\alpha}_k$ for *all* given instances $(\boldsymbol{A}, k)$. We also prove that *certifying* the RIP given $\boldsymbol{A}$, k *and* some $\delta_k \in (0,1)$ is coNP-complete in the strong sense; this is slightly stronger than the result from [20] mentioned above: Recall that strong NP-hardness implies that there cannot exist a fully polynomial-time approximation scheme (FPTAS), i.e., an algorithm that solves a minimization problem within a factor of $(1+\varepsilon)$ of the optimial value in polynomial time with respect to the input size and $1/\varepsilon$; an FPTAS often exists for weakly NP-hard problems.

Prior to this, in Section II, we prove NP-hardness in the strong sense of computing the *spark* of a matrix, i.e., the smallest number of linearly dependent columns. In fact, our main results concerning the complexity of determining the RIC or NSC follow from reduction of a decision problem concerning the existence of inclusion-wise minimal such column subsets. The term spark was first defined in [29], where strong results considering uniqueness of solutions to (P_0) were proven. Ever since, its value has been claimed to be NP-hard to calculate, but, to the best of our knowledge, without a proof or reference for this fact. It seems to have escaped researchers' notice that [30] contains a proof that deciding whether the spark equals the number of rows is weakly NP-hard, by reduction from the Subset Sum Problem (cf. [MP9] in [4]). Even earlier, in [31], the authors claim to have a proof, but give credit to the dissertation [32] for establishing NP-hardness of spark computations. However, after closer inspection, the result in [32] is in fact *not* about the spark, but the girth of so-called transversal matroids of bipartite graphs. We adapt the proof idea from [32], a reduction from the k-Clique Problem, to vector matroids and thus establish that spark computation is *strongly* NP-hard; see Section II for more details.

Instead of the intractable RIP, NSP, or spark, the weaker but efficiently computable *mutual coherence* [21] is sometimes used. It can be shown that the mutual coherence yields bounds on the RIC, NSC, and the spark; see, for instance, [24], [33]. Thus, imposing certain conditions involving the mutual coherence of a matrix can yield uniqueness and recoverability (by basis pursuit or other heuristics), see, e.g., [33]. However, the sparsity levels for which the mutual coherence can guarantee recoverability are quite often too small to be of practical use.

Throughout the article, for an $m \times n$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ and a subset $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we denote by $\boldsymbol{A}_S$ the submatrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$ formed by the columns indexed by S. Similarly, $\boldsymbol{x}_S$ denotes the part of a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ containing the entries indexed by S. By $\boldsymbol{A}^\top$ and $\boldsymbol{x}^\top$, we denote the transpose of a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ or vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, respectively. For graph theoretic concepts and notation we refer to [34], for complexity theory to [4], and for matroid theory to [35].

II. COMPLEXITY ISSUES RELATED TO THE SPARK

In this section, we deal with complexity issues related to linearly dependent columns of a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$. Inclusion-wise minimal collections of linearly dependent columns are called circuits. More precisely, a *circuit* is a set $C \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ of column indices such that $\boldsymbol{A}_C \boldsymbol{x} = 0$ has a nonzero solution, but every proper subset of C does not have this property, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) = |C| - 1 = \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_{C \setminus \{j\}})$ for every $j \in C$. For the sake of notational simplicity, we will sometimes identify circuits C with solutions $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of $\boldsymbol{Ax} = 0$ having support C. The spark of A is then the size of its smallest circuit.

As mentioned in the introduction, the computation of the size of a smallest circuit was already shown to be (weakly) NP-hard by [30, Theorem 1]. On the other hand, in [32] it was shown that computing a smallest circuit of a transversal matroid is (strongly) NP-hard. Only recently, a variant of the latter proof has resurfaced in [36], where it is used to derive complexity results for constructing so-called *full spark frames*, i.e., matrices exhibiting the highest possible spark. Every transversal matroid can be represented by a matrix over any infinite field or finite field with sufficiently large cardinality [37], but there is no known deterministic way to construct such a matrix.

We present a modification of the aforementioned proof in the following—see Remarks 1 and 2 below for more discussion of the differences to [32] and [30].

Theorem 1: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and a positive integer k, the problem to decide whether there exist a circuit of $\boldsymbol{A}$ of size at most k is NP-complete in the strong sense.

The following auxiliary results are used in our proof:

Lemma 1: The vertex-edge incidence matrix of an undirected simple graph with N vertices, B bipartite components, and Q isolated vertices has rank $N - B - Q$.

This result seems to be rediscovered every once in a while. The earliest proof we are aware of is due to van Nuffelen [38] and works through various case distinctions considering linear dependencies of the rows and consequences of the existence of isolated or bipartite components.

Lemma 2: Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple undirected graph, without isolated vertices, with vertex set V and edge set E. Let $\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{A}(G)$ be its vertex-edge incidence matrix, and let $k > 4$ be some integer. Suppose G only has connected components with at least four vertices each, $|E| = \binom{k}{2}$, and $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}) = k$. Then the graph G has exactly $|V| = k$ vertices.

Proof: Let $G = (V, E)$ and $k > 4$ be the simple graph and integer given in the statement of the lemma. Assume that

G has no component with less than 4 vertices, has $|E| = \binom{k}{2}$ edges, and that its incidence matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ has $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}) = k$.

Since G has no isolated vertices, Lemma 1 tells us that the number of vertices is

$$N = \operatorname{rank}(A) + B = k + B,$$

where B is the number of bipartite components in G. Assume that $B > 0$, since otherwise the lemma is trivially true.

We claim that the number of edges in G can be at most

$$|E| \le \binom{N}{2} - \frac{4(N-4)}{2}B - 2\,B. \tag{3}$$

To see this, recall that G can have at most $\binom{N}{2}$ edges. Each connected component has at least four vertices. Since there are no edges between such a component and vertices outside, the total number of possible edges is reduced by at least $4(N-4)/2$ per component (the factor $1/2$ ensures that we do not count any edges twice). Since G has at least B connected components, the possible number of edges is hence decreased at least by the second term. Moreover, since each bipartite component has at least four vertices, at least two of the potential edges cannot be present inside each such component, which yields the last term. Note that the bound (3) is sharp if G consists only of bipartite components with four vertices each.

Expanding (3) using $N = k + B$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|E| &\le \binom{N}{2} - \frac{4(N-4)}{2}B - 2\,B\\ &= \frac{(k+B)(k+B-1)}{2} - \frac{4(k+B-4)}{2}B - 2\,B\\ &= \tfrac{1}{2}k^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}k - k\,B - \tfrac{3}{2}B^2 + \tfrac{11}{2}\,B\\ &= \binom{k}{2} - (k\,B + \tfrac{3}{2}B^2 - \tfrac{11}{2}\,B),\end{aligned}$$

and observe that

$$k\,B + \tfrac{3}{2}B^2 - \tfrac{11}{2}\,B \ge 5\,B + \tfrac{3}{2}B^2 - \tfrac{11}{2}\,B = \tfrac{3}{2}B^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\,B > 0$$

if $B > 0$. Thus, there are strictly less than $\binom{k}{2}$ edges, contradicting the requirement $|E| = \binom{k}{2}$. Hence, $B = 0$. ■

Proof of Theorem 1: The problem is clearly in NP: Given a subset C of column indices of $\boldsymbol{A}$, it can be verified in polynomial time that $|C| \le k$ and that $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) = |C| - 1 = \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_{C\setminus\{j\}})$ for every $j \in C$ (by Gaussian elimination, see, e.g., [39]).

To show hardness, we reduce the strongly NP-complete k-Clique Problem (cf. [GT19] in [4], or [40]): Given a simple undirected graph G, decide whether G has a *clique*, i.e., a vertex-induced complete subgraph, of size k. We may assume without loss of generality that $k > 4$.

For the given graph G with n vertices and m edges construct a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} = (a_{ie})$ of size $(n + \binom{k}{2} - k - 1) \times m$ as follows: Index the first n rows of $\boldsymbol{A}$ by the vertices of G and its columns with the edges of G. Let the first n rows of $\boldsymbol{A}$ contain the vertex-edge incidence matrix of G (i.e., set $a_{ie} = 1$ if $i \in e$, and 0 otherwise). For the non-vertex rows $n + j$, $j \in \{1, \dots, \binom{k}{2} - k - 1\}$, set $a_{(n+j)e} = 2^{e\,j}$ (here we identify the vertices and edges with their indices); note that this corresponds to the bottom part of A consisting of a Vandermonde matrix (each column consists of increasing powers of the distinct numbers $2^1, \dots, 2^m$) without the usual all-ones first row. Clearly, this matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ can be constructed in polynomial time, and its encoding length is polynomially related to that of the input.

We first show that G has a k-clique if and only if $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit of size $\binom{k}{2}$. Suppose that G has a k-clique, $k > 4$, say on the vertices in the set R (so that $|R| = k$), and with its $\binom{k}{2}$ edges in the set C. Since $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has all-zero rows for each vertex outside of R, $|R| +$(number of non-vertex rows) $= \binom{k}{2} - 1 = |C| - 1$. Clearly, a clique is never bipartite (it always contains odd cycles, for $k \ge 3$). Hence, by Lemma 1, the rows of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ indexed by R are linearly independent. The lower part of A was chosen Vandermonde-like, so all its submatrices have full rank; in particular, the one containing only columns from C has full row-rank $\binom{k}{2} - k - 1$. Moreover, every row of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ indexed by R is linearly independent from the non-vertex rows of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$. (This can be seen inductively: Since $k > 4$, there are always less than $|C| - 4$ non-vertex rows in $\boldsymbol{A}_C$. Thus, these rows along with any two unit vectors remain linearly independent. Replacing these two unit vectors by their sum, again leaves a linearly independent set of rows. We can continue this way, adding different unit vectors to the sum, and see that every 0/1-vector—in particular those that are the rows of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ indexed by R—is linearly independent from the non-vertex rows of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$.) Thus, $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) = k + \binom{k}{2} - k - 1 = |C| - 1$. Now observe that removing any edge from a k-clique does not affect the rank of the associated incidence matrix, since the subgraph remains connected and non-bipartite with less vertices than edges (for $k \ge 4$). Thus, by Lemma 1, the rank of the nonzero vertex row part of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ remains k if any column from C is removed. Clearly, the rank of the lower part of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ stays the same as well, as there still are more columns than rows. Thus, $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_{C\setminus\{e\}}) = \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) = |C| - 1$ for every $e \in C$, i.e., C is a circuit.

Conversely, suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit C of size $|C| = \binom{k}{2}$ with $k > 4$. Then, by definition of a circuit, $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) = |C| - 1$, so $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has at least $|C| - 1$ nonzero rows. Since these include the $|C| - k - 1$ non-vertex rows, the set R of nonzero vertex rows of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has size $|R| \ge \big(|C| - 1\big) - \big(|C| - k - 1\big) = k$. Moreover, the non-vertex part of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has full rank and, as seen above, is linearly independent from any vertex row of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$. Thus, the upper part of $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ must have rank *exactly* k.

Observe that the subgraph (R, C) of G with vertex set R and edge set C cannot contain components with less than 4 vertices: such a subgraph (R', C') could have at most as many edges as vertices, so that the associated incidence matrix $\boldsymbol{A}'_{C'}$ has full *column* rank. Removing a column corresponding to an edge $e \in C'$ would reduce the rank, i.e., $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}'_{C'\setminus\{e\}}) < \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}'_{C'})$. In particular, removing any column from $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ does not affect the rank contribution of the non-vertex row part of $\boldsymbol{A}$, so that removing e would also yield $\operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_{C\setminus\{e\}}) = \operatorname{rank}(\boldsymbol{A}_C) - 1$, contradicting the fact that C is a circuit. Thus, Lemma 2 applies to the graph (R, C) and yields that $|R| = k$. This implies that the vertices in R form a k-clique, because R can induce at most $\binom{k}{2}$ edges and the $\binom{k}{2}$ edges in C are among them.

We now show that each circuit of $\boldsymbol{A}$ has size *at least* $\binom{k}{2}$. This proves the claim, since by the arguments above, it shows that there exists a circuit of size *at most* (in fact, exactly) $\binom{k}{2}$ if and only if G has a k-clique, i.e., for the given construction a solution to the spark problem yields a solution to the clique problem as well.

Suppose that $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit C with $c := |C| < \binom{k}{2}$. Let $d = \binom{k}{2} - c > 0$. Since C is a circuit, $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has $c-1$ nonzero rows (similar to the arguments above). Because the $\binom{k}{2} - k - 1$ non-vertex rows are among these, and by Lemma 2, $\boldsymbol{A}_C$ has $(c-1) - \left(\binom{k}{2} - k - 1\right) = k - d$ nonzero vertex rows. Denote the set of such rows by R, and let r be the number of edges in the subgraph of G induced by the vertices in R. Since $|R| = k - d$ vertices can induce at most $\binom{k-d}{2}$ edges, $r \leq \binom{k-d}{2}$. But surely all the edges in C are among those induced by R, so that $r \geq c = \binom{k}{2} - d$. Putting these inequalities together yields $\binom{k}{2} - d \leq r \leq \binom{k-d}{2}$. However, since we assumed $k > 4$, it holds that $\binom{k}{2} - d > \binom{k-d}{2}$, yielding a contradiction. Consequently, every circuit C of A must satisfy $|C| \geq \binom{k}{2}$. ■

The smallest size (cardinality) of a circuit can be expressed as

$$\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) := \min\{\, \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \mid \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0,\ \boldsymbol{x} \neq 0 \,\}. \qquad (4)$$

Clearly, there exists a circuit of size at most k if and only if the spark is at most k. Hence, Theorem 1 immediately yields the following.

Corollary 1: Computing $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A})$ is strongly NP-hard.

Remark 1: The idea of reducing from the clique problem to prove Theorem 1 is due to Larry Stockmeyer and appears in Theorem 3.3.6 of [32] (see also [31], [36]). However, [32] uses *generic* matrices that, in fact, represent transversal matroids (of bipartite graphs) and therefore have certain properties needed in the proof. The entries of these generic matrices are not specified, and to date there is no known deterministic way to do so such that the matrix represents a transversal matroid. We replaced the corresponding machinery by our explicit matrix construction and the arguments using Lemmas 1 and 2 to become independent of transversal matroid representations and work directly on vector matroids. For clarity, we split the result into Theorems 1 and Corollary 1. Note that the proof of Theorem 1 also shows NP-completeness of the problem to decide whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit C with $|C| = k$.

Remark 2: The results above are related to, but different from, the following.

1) Theorem 1 in [30] shows that for an $m \times n$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, it is NP-hard to decide whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ has an $m \times m$ submatrix with zero determinant. This implies NP-hardness of computing the spark for the special case of the spark being equal to the row number of A. This restriction can in principle be removed, by appending all-zero rows to the matrix from the proof in [30], but one would then no longer be in the interesting case where the matrix has full (row) rank.

   Note that the reduction in [30] is from the Subset Sum Problem, so the derived NP-hardness holds in the weak sense. Our reduction from k-Clique yields NP-hardness in the strong sense. Moreover, our proof admits spark values other than the row number. However, the row and column numbers in the reduction depend on the instance.
2) In contrast to the results above, for graphic matroids, the girth can be computed in polynomial time [41], [32].
3) The paper [42] proves NP-hardness of computing the girth of the binary matroid, i.e., a vector matroid over $\mathbb{F}_2$. This, however, does not imply NP-hardness over the field of rational or real numbers, and the proof cannot be extended accordingly. Similarly, in [43] it was shown that, over $\mathbb{F}_2$, it is NP-complete to decide whether there exists a vector with k nonzero entries in the nullspace of a matrix. However, while this proof straightforwardly extends to the rational case, the result does not imply hardness of computing the spark either: While having $\operatorname{spark} = k' < k$ implies that there also is a *circuit* of size k, it does *not* guarantee that there also is a *vector with k nonzeros* in the nullspace. Furthermore, in [43] there is no lower bound on the spark as in Theorem 1.

We also have the following result, which shows another relation between minimum cardinality circuits and the task of finding sparsest solutions to underdetermined linear systems.

Corollary 2: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{B}$, a specific column $\boldsymbol{b}$ of $\boldsymbol{B}$, and a positive integer k, the problem of deciding whether there exists a circuit of $\boldsymbol{B}$ of size k which contains $\boldsymbol{b}$ is NP-complete in the strong sense. Consequently, it is strongly NP-hard to determine the minimum cardinality of circuits that contain a specific column $\boldsymbol{b}$ of $\boldsymbol{B}$.

Proof: Denote by $\boldsymbol{A}$ the matrix $\boldsymbol{B}$ without the column $\boldsymbol{b}$. Then it is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{B}$ has a circuit of size k that contains $\boldsymbol{b}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}$ has a solution with $k-1$ nonzero entries. Deciding the latter is well-known to be NP-complete in the strong sense, see [MP5] in [4]. Moreover, computing the smallest possible size of those circuits that include $\boldsymbol{b}$ is equivalent to solving $\min\{\, \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \mid \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}\}$. But this is precisely (P_0), which is well-known to be strongly NP-hard. ■

Remark 3: As mentioned in [29], one can reduce spark computations to (P_0) as follows: For each column of $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ in turn, add a new row with a 1 in this column and 0 elsewhere. The right hand side $\boldsymbol{b}$ is the m-th unit vector. Now solve each such (P_0) problem, and take the solution with smallest support. Interestingly, we do not know an easy reduction of the reverse direction (other than the very general reduction, because both associated decision problems are NP-complete).

To conclude this section, we briefly consider so-called full spark frames. An $m \times n$ matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ with full rank m ($m \leq n$) is said to be *full spark* if $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) = m+1$, i.e., every submatrix consisting of at most m columns of $\boldsymbol{A}$ has full rank. In [36], it was shown that testing a matrix for this property is hard for NP under randomized reductions. In fact, however, the following stronger result holds:

Corollary 3: Given a rational matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, it is coNP-complete to decide whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a full spark frame.

Proof: We can assume w.l.o.g. that $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ with rank $m \leq n$. Thus, $\boldsymbol{A}$ is full spark if $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) = m+1$. Clearly, $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) = m+1$ holds if and only if the question whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a singular $m \times m$ submatrix has a negative answer.

Since the latter decision problem is (weakly) NP-complete by [30, Theorem 1], deciding whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ is a full spark frame is coNP-hard.

Moreover, this problem is contained in coNP, since the "no" answer can be certified in polynomial time by specifying a singular (square) submatrix and because checking singularity can be done in polynomial time. ■

Note that for the above proof, we cannot employ Theorem 1 (to obtain hardness in the strong sense), because this would require considering the matrix construction used in the reduction from the clique problem (see proof of the theorem) with $k = n-1$, since in that case the matrix has $\binom{k}{2} = n+\binom{k}{2}-k-1$ rows and we show hardness for asking whether the spark is at most $\binom{k}{2}$. However, the clique problem can be solved in polynomial time for any *constant* k, and in the above-described scenario, k would indeed no longer be part of the problem input.

Remark 4: Above, and in the related complexity results to follow, we show that the decision problem under consideration has a *negative* answer if and only if a known NP-complete problem has a *positive* answer. Since by definition the complementary problem of an NP-complete problem is coNP-complete, the respective hardness results follow—see also [4]. Both NP- and coNP-completeness imply that no polynomial time algorithm exists unless P=NP (or equivalently P=coNP). Since a problem is NP-hard if and only if it is coNP-hard (every problem in coNP can be Turing-reduced to it; cf [34, Ch. 15.7]), we use the term NP-hard throughout the article.

In the next sections we shall see how we can deduce NP-hardness of computing restricted isometry or nullspace constants from the above results.

III. NP-HARDNESS OF COMPUTING THE RESTRICTED ISOMETRY CONSTANT

Many recoverability results are based on the restricted isometry property (RIP) of a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$. Recall that for a positive integer k, $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the RIP of order k with constant δ_k if (1) holds. Given $\boldsymbol{A}$ and k, the smallest such constant is the RIC $\underline{\delta}_k$. Note that (1) holds for $\delta_k = 0$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{A}$ is orthogonal and that $\delta_k < 0$ is impossible.

A popular result states that if the RIP of order $2k$ is satisfied with some constant $\delta_{2k} < \sqrt{2}-1$ then ℓ_0-ℓ_1-equivalence holds (i.e., the solutions of (P_1) and (P_0) coincide) if the optimal solution to (P_0) has at most k nonzeros, see [10]. A series of papers has been devoted to developing conditions of this flavor, often by probabilistic analyses. One of the most recent results, see [44], shows that ℓ_0-ℓ_1-equivalence for k-sparse solutions already holds if $\delta_k < 0.307$ is feasible (note that the RIP order is k, not $2k$ as above). Similar conditions exist for the denoising problem and greedy algorithms, see, e.g., [10], [15].

Ever since the RIP has been introduced, it has been remarked that its evaluation is suspected to be computationally intractable, based on the observation that a brute-force method would have to inspect all submatrices induced by column subsets of sizes up to k. Of course, by itself, this does not generally rule out the possible existence of an efficient algorithm. However, we show below that (given $\boldsymbol{A}$ and k) deciding whether there exists a constant $\delta_k < 1$ such that (1) holds is coNP-complete in the strong sense. Thus, unless P=coNP, which is equivalent to P=NP, there exists no polynomial time algorithm to answer this question.

We need the following technical result in the following.

Lemma 3: Let $\boldsymbol{A} = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ be a matrix. Define

$$\mathcal{A}_{\max} := \max\{|a_{ij}| \mid i \in \{1,\dots,m\},\ j \in \{1,\dots,n\}\}$$

and $C := 2^{\lceil \log_2(\mathcal{A}_{\max}\sqrt{mn})\rceil}$. Then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}} := \frac{1}{C}\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ and } \delta \geq 0.$$

Moreover, the encoding length of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ is polynomial in that of $\boldsymbol{A}$.

Proof: First, observe that the largest singular value of $\boldsymbol{A}$, $\sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A})$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A}) = \|\boldsymbol{A}\|_2 &\leq \mathcal{A}_{\max}\sqrt{mn}\\ &\leq 2^{\lceil \log_2(\mathcal{A}_{\max}\sqrt{mn})\rceil} = C.\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 &\leq \|\tfrac{1}{C}\boldsymbol{A}\|_2^2\,\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\\ &\leq \tfrac{1}{\sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A})^2}\|\boldsymbol{A}\|_2^2\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2\end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta \geq 0$. Moreover, the encoding length of C and of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ is clearly polynomially bounded by m, n, and the encoding length of $\boldsymbol{A}$. ■

By the singular value interlacing theorem (see, e.g., [45]), $\sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A})$ is an upper bound for the largest singular value of every submatrix of $\boldsymbol{A}$. Thus, the above lemma essentially shows that by scaling the matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$, one can focus on the left part of the RIP (1) (a similar argument has been derived independently in [20]). This leads to the following complexity result.

Theorem 2: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ and a positive integer k, the problem to decide whether there exists some constant $\delta_k < 1$ such that $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the RIP of order k with constant δ_k is strongly coNP-complete.

Proof: We first show that the problem is in coNP. To certify the "no" answer, it suffices to consider a vector $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $1 \leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \leq k$ that tightly satisfies (1) for $\delta_k = 1$. This implies $\boldsymbol{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}} = 0$. Clearly, since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is contained in the nullspace of $\boldsymbol{A}$, we can assume that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is rational with encoding length polynomially bounded by the size of $\boldsymbol{A}$. Then, we can verify $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k$ and $\boldsymbol{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}} = 0$ in polynomial time, which shows that the "no" answer can be certified in polynomial time.

To show hardness, we reduce the problem to decide whether there exists a circuit of size at most k, which is strongly NP-complete by Theorem 1. Consider the matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ as defined in Lemma 3; note that the circuits of $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ coincide, since nonzero scaling does not affect linear dependencies among columns. We claim that there exists a circuit $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \leq k$ if and only if $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ *violates* (1) for *all* $\delta_k < 1$. Since deciding the former question is NP-complete, this completes the proof.

Clearly, if such an $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ exists, then

$$(1-\delta_k) \leq \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2^2 = 0$$

implies that we must have $\delta_k \geq 1$.

For the converse, assume that there does not exist $\delta_k < 1$ for which (1) holds. By Lemma 3, the right part of (1) is always satisfied. Consequently, there must exist a vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $1 \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \leq k$ such that the left part is tight, i.e.,

$$0 \geq (1-\delta_k) = \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\,\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2^2 \geq 0.$$

This implies that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\,\hat{\boldsymbol{x}} = 0$. Thus, there also exists a circuit $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \leq k$, which shows the claim. ■

Usually, one is interested in the smallest constant δ_k for which (1) holds, i.e., the *restricted isometry constant (RIC)*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\delta}_k := \min_{\delta \geq 0}\ & \delta \\ \text{s.t. } & (1-\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq (1+\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \\ & \text{for all } \boldsymbol{x} \text{ with } \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Recall that $\delta < 0$ is impossible, resulting in the condition $\delta \geq 0$ in (6). We immediately obtain the following complexity result.

Corollary 4: For a given matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and positive integer k, it is strongly NP-hard to compute the restricted isometry constant $\underline{\delta}_k$.

Proof: By definition, $\underline{\delta}_k \leq \delta_k$ for any constant δ_k such that $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the RIP of order k with constant δ_k. But Theorem 2 shows that deciding whether there exists a constant $\delta_k < 1$ is coNP-complete in the strong sense. Computing $\underline{\delta}_k$ answers that decision problem and hence must be strongly NP-hard. ■

A. Asymmetric restricted isometry constants

It has been remarked in [9] that the symmetric nature of the RIP can be overly restrictive. In particular, the influence of the right inequality in (6) is often stronger, although the left inequality is more important in the context of sparse recovery. For instance, the often stated condition $\underline{\delta}_{2k} < 1$ for uniqueness of k-sparse solutions (see, e.g., [10]) should in fact read $\underline{\delta}_{2k}^L < 1$, where

$$\underline{\delta}_k^L := \min_{\delta \geq 0} \delta \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (1-\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} : \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k \tag{7}$$

is the lower *asymmetric* restricted isometry constant [9] (see also [46]). Correspondingly, the upper asymmetric RIC is given by

$$\underline{\delta}_k^U := \min_{\delta \geq 0} \delta \quad \text{s.t.} \quad (1+\delta)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \geq \|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} : \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k. \tag{8}$$

The central argument in the proof of Theorem 2 in fact shows the following:

Corollary 5: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and a positive integer k, it is strongly NP-hard to compute $\underline{\delta}_k^L$.

In contrast, the computational complexity of computing the upper asymmetric RIC $\underline{\delta}_k^U$ seems to be unknown. Note that $1 + \underline{\delta}_k^U$ is always bounded above by the largest singular value $\sigma_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A})$ of $\boldsymbol{A}$. However, rewriting (8) as

$$\underline{\delta}_k^U = \max\{\, \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \mid S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\},\ |S| \leq k \,\} - 1,$$

it is clear that this bound generally needs not be tight.

B. RIP certification

In this section, we show that the RIP certification problem, i.e., deciding whether a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the RIP with given order k and *given* constant $\delta_k \in (0,1)$, is coNP-complete. The main arguments used in the proofs of the following Lemma and Corollary have been independently derived by us and the authors of [20].

The following observation is essential.

Lemma 4: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$ and a positive integer k, if $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) > k$, there exists a constant $\varepsilon > 0$ with encoding length polynomially bounded by k and that of $\boldsymbol{A}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \geq \varepsilon\, \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2$ for all x with $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \leq k$.

Proof: Assume without loss of generality that $\boldsymbol{A}$ has only integer entries (this can always be achieved by scaling with the least common denominator of the matrix entries, which influences ε by a polynomial factor only).

Define $\mathcal{A}_{\max}$ as in Lemma 3. Note that $\operatorname{spark}(\boldsymbol{A}) > k$ implies that every submatrix $\boldsymbol{A}_S$ with $S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$, $|S| \leq k$, has linearly independent columns. Consider an arbitrary such S. Then, $\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S$ is positive definite, so its smallest eigenvalue fulfills $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) > 0$ and also $\det(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) > 0$. Moreover, since the absolute values of entries of $\boldsymbol{A}$ are integers in $\{0,1,\dots,\mathcal{A}_{\max}\}$, the entries of $\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S$ are also integral and lie in $\{0,1,\dots,m\,\mathcal{A}_{\max}^2\}$. Therefore, it must in fact hold that $\det(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \geq 1$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \geq 1$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq \det(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) &= \prod_{i=1}^{|S|} \lambda_i(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \\ &\leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \cdot \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S)^{k-1} \\ &\leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \left(|S| \cdot \max_{1 \leq i,j \leq |S|} |(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S)_{ij}| \right)^{k-1} \\ &\leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \left(k\, m\, \mathcal{A}_{\max}^2 \right)^{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have that

$$\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S) \geq \frac{1}{(k\, m\, \mathcal{A}_{\max}^2)^{k-1}} =: \varepsilon > 0. \tag{9}$$

Since S was arbitrary, $\|\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \geq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{A}_S^\top \boldsymbol{A}_S)\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2 \geq \varepsilon\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_2^2$ for all $\boldsymbol{x}$ with support $S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$, $|S| \leq k$. Moreover, the encoding length of $\mathcal{A}_{\max}$, and therefore that of ε, is clearly polynomially bounded by k and the encoding length of $\boldsymbol{A}$, which completes the proof. ■

Corollary 6: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m \times n}$, a positive integer k, and some constant $\delta_k \in (0,1)$, it is coNP-hard in the strong sense to decide whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the RIP of order k with constant δ_k.

Proof: Consider a matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ as in Lemma 3, so we can again focus on the left inequality of the RIP. Clearly, if $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ has a circuit of size at most k, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ cannot satisfy the RIP of order k with any given $\delta_k \in (0,1)$, since in this case, $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2^2 = 0 < (1-\delta_k)\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_2^2$ for some $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \leq k$. Moreover, Lemma 4 shows that if $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ has no circuit of size at most k, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ satisfies the RIP or order k with constant $1 - \tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0,1)$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ has size polynomially bounded by k and that of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$, cf. (9). By Theorem 2, it is strongly coNP-complete to decide whether there exists a constant $\delta_k < 1$ such that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ satisfies the RIP of a given order k with this constant. But as seen above, such a constant exists if and only if $\tilde{\boldsymbol{A}}$ satisfies the RIP of k with the constant $1-\tilde{\varepsilon}$, too. Thus, deciding whether the RIP holds for a given matrix, order, *and* constant, is strongly NP-hard. ■

Remark 5: It is unclear whether the problem in Corollary 6 is in coNP: It does not seem easy to show that there exists a certificate $\boldsymbol{x}$ for the "no" answer with $1 \le \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \le k$ that violates the RIP with constant δ_k and has a polynomially bounded encoding length.

IV. NP-HARDNESS OF COMPUTING THE NULLSPACE CONSTANT

Similar to the RIP, the nullspace property (NSP) allows to guarantee ℓ_0-ℓ_1-equivalence. Recall that $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ satisfies the NSP of order k with constant α_k if (2) holds for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0$. The nullspace property guarantees exact recovery of k-sparse solutions to (P_0) by solving (P_1) whenever (2) holds with some constant $\alpha_k < 1/2$. More precisely, $\alpha_k < 1/2$ is feasible for (2) if and only if for all $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \le k$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is the unique solution to (P_1) with $\boldsymbol{A}$ and $\boldsymbol{b} := \boldsymbol{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$, see [22]. (In fact, this implies solution uniqueness for $\min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{\ell_p} \mid \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{b}\}$ for any $0 < p \le 1$, see [24], [25].) In particular, $\hat{\boldsymbol{x}}$ must then also be the unique solution to the corresponding (P_0)-instance, i.e., ℓ_0-ℓ_1-equivalence for k-sparse solutions holds.

As for the RIP, one is typically interested in the smallest constant $\underline{\alpha}_k$, the *nullspace constant (NSC)*, such that the NSP of order k holds with this constant. Thus, the NSC is given by

$$\underline{\alpha}_k := \min\ \alpha \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{k,1} \le \alpha \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \quad \forall \boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0, \tag{10}$$

or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\alpha}_k := \max\ & \|\boldsymbol{x}_S\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.}\ & \boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0,\ \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 = 1,\ S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\},\ |S| \le k. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

However, the following results show that computing $\underline{\alpha}_k$ is a challenging problem.

Theorem 3: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ and a positive integer k, the problem to decide whether $\boldsymbol{A}$ satisfies the NSP of order k with some constant $\alpha_k < 1$ is coNP-complete in the strong sense.

Proof: First of all, note that (2) is equivalent to the condition that

$$\|\boldsymbol{x}_S\|_1 \le \alpha_k\, \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1 \tag{12}$$

holds for all $S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$, $|S| \le k$, and $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0$. Clearly, (2) and (12) always hold for some $\alpha_k \in [0,1]$.

We first show that the problem is in coNP. To certify the "no" answer, it suffices to consider a vector $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}} = 0$ and a set $\emptyset \neq S \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$ with $|S| \le k$ that tightly satisfy (12) for $\alpha_k = 1$. This implies that S equals the support of $\boldsymbol{x}$. Thus, $1 \le \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}\|_0 \le k$. Clearly, since $\tilde{\boldsymbol{x}}$ is contained in the nullspace of $\boldsymbol{A}$, it can be assumed to be rational with encoding length polynomially bounded by the size of $\boldsymbol{A}$. This shows that the "no" answer can be certified in polynomial time.

To show hardness, we claim that the matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit of size at most k if and only if there does *not* exist any $\alpha_k < 1$ such that (2) holds. Since the former problem is strongly NP-complete by Theorem 1, this completes the proof.

Assume $\boldsymbol{A}$ has a circuit of size at most k. Then there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ in the nullspace of $\boldsymbol{A}$ with $1 \le \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \le k$. It follows that $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{k,1} = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1$. Thus, (2) implies $\alpha_k \ge 1$. Since, trivially, $\alpha_k \le 1$, we conclude that $\alpha_k = 1$.

Conversely, assume that there exists no $\alpha_k < 1$ such that (2) holds for $\boldsymbol{A}$ and k. This implies that there is a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$ with $\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{x} = 0$ and $1 \le \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_0 \le k$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{x}\|_{k,1} = \|\boldsymbol{x}\|_1$, because otherwise $\alpha_k < 1$ would be possible. But this means that the support of $\boldsymbol{x}$ contains a circuit of $\boldsymbol{A}$ of size at most k, which shows the claim. ■

We immediately obtain the following.

Corollary 7: Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ and a positive integer k, it is strongly NP-hard to compute the nullspace constant $\underline{\alpha}_k$.

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The results of this paper show that it is coNP-complete (in the strong sense) to answer the following questions in the case $\gamma = 1$: "Given a matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ and a positive integer k, does the RIP or NSP hold with some constant $< \gamma$?" It is important to note that our results do not imply the hardness for every *fixed* constant $\gamma < 1$. (Note that such questions become solvable in time $\mathcal{O}(n^{\mathrm{poly}(k)})$ if k is fixed.) For instance, Corollary 6 asserts that it is strongly coNP-complete to certify the RIP for given $\boldsymbol{A}$, k and $\delta_k \in (0,1)$ *in general*. The actual δ_k appearing in the proof, however, is very close to 1 and thus far from values of γ that could yield recovery guarantees; cf. the remarks following [20, Theorem 4]. Similarly, the NSP guarantees ℓ_0-ℓ_1-*equivalence* for $\underline{\alpha}_k < 1/2$, while we proved hardness only for deciding whether $\underline{\alpha}_k < 1$ (which implies that *computing* $\underline{\alpha}_k$ is hard). The complexity of these related questions remain open. Nevertheless, our results provide a justification to investigate general approximation algorithms (which compute bounds on $\underline{\delta}_k$ or $\underline{\alpha}_k$), as done in [28], [17], [26], [18], instead of searching for exact polynomial time algorithms.

One could also investigate whether it is hard to approximate the constants associated with the RIP or NSP in polynomial time to within some factor; strong inapproximability results for (P_0) appear in [47].

Moreover, (co)NP-hardness does not necessarily exclude the possibility of *practically* efficient algorithms. So far, to the best of our knowledge, the focus has been laid largely on relaxations or heuristics. In [19], it was shown that one can do better than exhaustive search to certify the RIP, making use of the nondecreasing monotonicity of $\underline{\delta}_k$ with growing k. More work on exact algorithms could shed more light on the behavior of the RIP and NSP.

REFERENCES

[1] D. L. Donoho, "Compressed sensing," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, pp. 1289–1306, Apr. 2006.

[2] M. Elad, *Sparse and redundant representations: From theory to applications in signal and image processing*. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 2010.

[3] M. Fornasier and H. Rauhut, "Compressive sensing," in *Handbook of mathematical methods in imaging*, O. Scherzer, Ed. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer, 2011, pp. 187–228.

[4] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson, *Computers and intractability. A guide to the theory of NP-completeness*. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1979.

[5] B. K. Natarajan, "Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 227–234, 1995.

[6] S. S. Chen, D. L. Donoho, and M. A. Saunders, "Atomic decomposition by basis pursuit," *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 33–61, 1998.

[7] E. Candès and T. Tao, "Decoding by linear programming," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, pp. 4203–4215, Dec. 2005.

[8] R. G. Baraniuk, M. A. Davenport, R. A. DeVore, and M. B. Wakin, "A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices," *Constr. Approx.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 253–263, 2008.

[9] J. D. Blanchard, C. Cartis, and J. Tanner, "Compressed sensing: How sharp is the RIP?" *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 105–125, 2011.

[10] E. Candès, "The restricted isometry property and its implications for compressed sensing," *C. R. Math.*, vol. 346, no. 9, pp. 589–592, 2008.

[11] B. Bah and J. Tanner, "Improved bounds on restricted isometry constants for Gaussian matrices," *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. A.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 2882–2892, 2010.

[12] R. A. DeVore, "Deterministic constructions of compressed sensing matrices," *J. Complexity*, vol. 23, pp. 918–925, 2007.

[13] M. A. Iwen, "Simple deterministically constructible RIP matrices with sublinear Fourier sampling requirements," in *Proc. 43rd Ann. Conf. Information Sciences and Systems (CISS), John Hopkins Univ.*, 2009, pp. 870–875.

[14] J. Bourgain, S. J. Dilworth, K. Ford, S. Konyagin, and D. Kutzarova, "Explicit constructions of RIP matrices and related problems," *Duke Math. J.*, 2011, to be published, [Online] Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1008.4535

[15] M. A. Davenport and M. B. Wakin, "Analysis of orthogonal matching pursuit using the restricted isometry property," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 4395–4401, Sep. 2010.

[16] J. A. Tropp, "Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse approximation," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, pp. 2231–2242, Oct. 2004.

[17] A. d'Aspremont, L. E. Ghaoui, M. I. Jordan, and G. R. G. Lanckriet, "A direct formulation for sparse PCA using semidefinite programming," *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 434–448, 2007.

[18] K. Lee and Y. Bressler, "Computing performance guarantess for compressed sensing," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP), Las Vegas*, 2008, pp. 5129–5132.

[19] P. Koiran and A. Zouzias, "On the certification of the restricted isometry property," submitted for publication, 2011, [Online] Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1103.4984

[20] A. S. Bandeira, E. Dobriban, D. G. Mixon, and W. F. Sawin, "Certifying the restricted isometry property is hard," submitted for publication, 2012, [Online] Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.1580

[21] D. L. Donoho and X. Huo, "Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 47, pp. 2845–2862, Nov. 2001.

[22] Y. Zhang, "Theory of compressive sensing via ℓ_1-minimization: A non-RIP analysis and extensions," Department of Computational and Applied Mathematics, Rice University, Houston, TX, Tech. Rep. TR08-11 (revised), 2008.

[23] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. DeVore, "Compressed sensing and best k-term approximation," *J. Am. Math. Soc.*, vol. 22, pp. 211–231, 2009.

[24] R. Gribonval and M. Nielsen, "Sparse representations in unions of bases," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, pp. 3320–3325, Dec. 2003.

[25] M. E. Davies and R. Gribonval, "Restricted isometry constants where ℓ^p sparse recovery can fail for $0 < p \leq 1$," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, pp. 2203–2214, May 2009.

[26] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski, "On verifiable sufficient conditions for sparse signal recovery via ℓ_1 minmization," *Math. Program.*, vol. 127, no. 1, pp. 57–88, 2011.

[27] A. d'Aspremont, F. Bach, and L. E. Ghaoui, "Optimal solutions for sparse principal component analysis," *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, vol. 9, pp. 1269–1294, 2008.

[28] A. d'Aspremont and L. E. Ghaoui, "Testing the nullspace property using semidefinite programming," *Math. Program.*, vol. 127, no. 1, pp. 123–144, 2011.

[29] D. L. Donoho and M. Elad, "Optimally sparse representation in general (non-orthogonal) dictionaries via ℓ^1 minimization," *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, vol. 100, no. 5, pp. 2197–2202, 2003.

[30] L. Khachiyan, "On the complexity of approximating extremat determinants in matrices," *J. Complexity*, vol. 11, pp. 138–153, 1995.

[31] T. F. Coleman and A. Pothen, "The null space problem I. Complexity," *SIAM J. Algebra. Discr.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 527–537, 1986.

[32] S. T. McCormick, "A combinatorial approach to some sparse matrix problems," Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1983.

[33] A. M. Bruckstein, D. L. Donoho, and M. Elad, "From sparse solutions of systems of equations to sparse modeling of signals and images," *SIAM Rev.*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 34–81, 2009.

[34] B. Korte and J. Vygen, *Combinatorial optimization. Theory and algorithms*, 4th ed., ser. Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 21. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 2008.

[35] J. G. Oxley, *Matroid theory*, 1st ed., ser. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 3. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

[36] B. Alexeev, J. Cahill, and D. G. Mixon, "Full spark frames," *J. Fourier Anal. Appl.*, 2011, to be published. [Online] Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1110.3548

[37] M. J. Piff, and D. J. A. Welsh, "On the vector representation of matroids," *J. London Math. Soc.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 284–288, 1970.

[38] C. van Nuffelen, "On the incidence matrix of a graph," *IEEE Trans. Circuits Syst.*, vol. CAS-23, p. 572, Sept. 1976.

[39] M. Grötschel, L. Lovász, and A. Schrijver, *Geometric algorithms and combinatorial optimization*, 2nd ed., ser. Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 2. Heidelberg, Germany: Springer, 1993.

[40] R. M. Karp, "Reducibility among combinatorial problems," in *Complexity of computer computations*, R. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, Eds. New York: Plenum Press, 1972, pp. 85–103.

[41] A. Itai and M. Rodeh, "Finding a minimum circuit in a graph," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 413–423, 1978.

[42] A. Vardy, "The intractability of computing the minimum distance of a code," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 43, pp. 1757–1766, Nov. 1997.

[43] E. R. Berlekamp, R. J. McEliece, and H. C. A. van Tilborg, "On the inherent intractability of certain coding problems," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. IT-24, pp. 384–386, May 1978.

[44] T. T. Cai, L. Wang, and G. Xu, "New bounds for restricted isometry constants," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 56, pp. 4388–4394, Sept. 2010.

[45] J. F. Queiró, "On the interlacing property for singular values and eigenvalues," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 97, pp. 23–28, 1987.

[46] S. Foucart and M.-J. Lai, "Sparsest solutions of underdetermined linear systems via ℓ_q-minimization for $0 \leq q \leq 1$," *Appl. Comput. Harmon. A.*, vol. 26, pp. 395–407, 2009.

[47] E. Amaldi and V. Kann, "On the approximability of minimizing nonzero variables or unsatisfied relations in linear systems," *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, vol. 209, pp. 237–260, 1998.

Marc E. Pfetsch obtained a Diploma degree in mathematics from the University of Heidelberg, Germany, in 1997. He received a PhD degree in mathematics in 2002 and the Habilitation degree in 2008 from TU Berlin, Germany. From 2008 to 2012 he was a Full Professor for Mathematical Optimization at TU Braunschweig, Germany. Since 04/2012 he has been a Full Professor for Discrete Optimization at TU Darmstadt, Germany. His research interests are mostly in discrete optimization, in particular symmetry in integer programs, compressed sensing, and algorithms for mixed integer programs.

Andreas M. Tillmann graduated in financial and business mathematics (Dipl.-Math. Oec. degree) from the TU Braunschweig, Germany, in 2009. As a doctoral candidate at the TU Braunschweig, he worked as a Teaching Assistant from 2009 to 2011, and has since been a Researcher on the project "SPEAR – Sparse Exact and Approximate Recovery", funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG). In 07/2012 he joined the Research Group Optimization at TU Darmstadt, Germany. His research interests are mainly in compressed sensing, focussing on exact ℓ_0-minimization, basis pursuit, and issues related to recovery conditions.